



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/534,403	03/22/2000	Yu Minakuchi	1341.1041/JDH	8398
21171	7590	11/21/2003	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			MIRZA, ADNAN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER 15
			2141	

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

09534403

03/22/00

Yu Mirkhailov 1341-104

EXAMINER

MIRZA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141 15

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MARK THOMPSON USPTO (3) ADNAN MIRZA USPTO
(2) MEHDI SHEIKERZ #41307 (4) _____

Date of Interview 11/20/03Type: Telephonic Televideo Conference Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No If yes, brief description: Applicant discussed the invention and it was concluded that external Server Controlled Client Reproduction / Rendering of Seal from of Agreement was reached. was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 3 & 11Identification of prior art discussed: Yao et al, Asamizuya et al

MUST NOTE: CLAIMED INVENTION CURRENTLY RELIES ON (A) SCHEDULING & (B) CLIENT RENDERING
Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant basically discussed the prior art on the record and pointed out the difference between the prior art and Applicant's invention. There was no agreement was reached. There were two parts to the invention was Scheduling and Reproduction / Rendering by the Client (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary. A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has not been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

MARC D. THOMPSON
MARC THOMPSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

GAO 2142